भी नहीं की हैं, उस के बारें में आप का आंकलन क्या हैं कि इस पर कितना खर्चा करना पड़ेगा ? साथ ही इस से कितने एककों को आप फायदा पहुंचा पाएंगे और यह फायदा किस हद तक पहुंचेगा ?

श्री सैयद शाहनवाज हुसैन: सभापति जी, अपने देश में पावरलूम की संख्या करीब 16 लाख हैं । उन में जो कपड़ा बनता है उस में 60 से 62 प्रतिशत कपड़ा पावरलूम के जरिए बनता है। इसलिए यह योजना पावरलूम के लिए बहुत बड़ी मदद के रूप में हैं । पहले भी हम ने इस के लिए बहुत सारी योजनाएं चलायी हैं, लेकिन खासकर पावरलूम अपग्रेडेशन बहुत दिनों से नहीं हुआ था । इसे ध्यान में रखकर सरकार ने निर्णय लिया है और यह टैक्नॉलाजिकल अपग्रेडेशन फडं (टी.यू.एफ) स्कीम बनाई जिस के तहत जो लोग नए लूम लागाएंगे, उस के अपग्रेडेशन के लिए हम ने यह सब्सिडी दी हैं । इस के तहत अगर वे 60 लाख की लागत लगाएंगे तो उन को 20 परसेंट की सब्सिडी सरकार देगी । सभापति जी, इस से पावरलूम के क्षेत्र में बहुत बड़ा उद्वार होने वाला हैं ।

BPL families identified under SJGSY

*223. SHRI MURLI DEORA: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of BPL families identified under the Swamjayanti Gram SwarozgarYojana, State-wise;

(b) the names of States which did not contribute their share of funds along with the reasons therefor;

(c) whether there were large scale diversions and mis-utilization of the funds and if so, the number of complaints received in this regard, State-wise; and

(d) the steps taken to check the deficiencies?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL) (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) No specific survey has been conducted for identification of Below Poverty Line (BPL) families under the Swaranjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY). However, during each Five Year Plan, the Ministry of Rural Development assists the State Government to conduct a BPL

Census with a view to identifying households living below the poverty line who could be assisted under various anti-poverty Programmes including SGSY implemented by the Ministry. Accordingly, the States/ UTs were advised to identify the BPL households for assistance during the Tenth Plan and to complete the BPL Census, 2002 by June 2003. However, due to the ruling of the Hob'ble Supreme Court on 5th May, 2003, in People's Union of Civil Liberties (PUCL) Writ Petition No. 196 of 2001, the State Governments have been advised not to finalise the BPL list until the next hearing of the case. The results of BPL Census (2002) are to be finalized after obtaining the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in this regard. The State-wise break up of BPL families as per 1997 Census is annexed.

(b) The funds under the scheme are released to District Rural Development Agencies directly in two instalments. The first instalment is released without any formal request from DRDAs if the second instalment was released to them unconditionally in the previous year. The release of State share in the previous year is examined at the time of processing of proposals for release of second instalment. An amount equal to three times the shortfall in the release of State share in the previous year is deducted from the Central release of the second instalment in the current year. As per the reports of the State Governments available with the Ministry, the States of Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Goa, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal did not contribute their full matching State share cumulatively since inception to 2002-2003 due to their difficult financial position.

(c) No, Sir, no large scale diversion and misutilization have been reported. Neither complaints in this regard have been received by this Ministry from any State. However, as per Reports No. 3 of 2003 of Comptroller and Auditor General, some instances of diversion/ misutilisation of SGSY funds amounting to Rs. 58.39 crore in the States/ UTs of Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Goa, Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Mizoram, Orissa, Pondicherry, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal have been reported during the period of 1999-2002.

(d) State Governments and respective District Rural Development Agencies are regularly asked to utilize the funds as per the guidelines of the Scheme. Wherever cases of temporary diversion of funds come to light in the audit reports of the Chartered Accountants, the DRDAs are directed to recoup the funds.

Statement

Results of the BPL Census-1997

SI. No.	State/UT	Total No. of Rural Families	No. of BPL Rural Families	% of BPL Families
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	10484028	4184628	39.91
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	102852	80627	78.39
3.	Assam	3607241	2164416	60.00
4.	Bihar	18933813	9399281	49.64
5.	Goa	135816	23101	17.01
6.	Gujarat	5587768	1980879	35.45
7.	Haryana	2074615	503019	24.25
8.	Himachal Pradesh	1036996	286112	27.59
9.	JandK	1047251	606545	57.92
10.	Karnataka	6479832	2202756	33.99
11.	Kerala	4714295	1723556	36.56
12.	Madhya Pradesh	11651082	5111874	43.87
13.	Maharashtra	11010022	3860675	35.07
14.	Manipur	365670	246980	67.54
15.	Meghalaya	282362	156646	55.48
16.	Mizoram	110570	74154	67.07
17.	Nagaland$$	146615	88541	60.39
18.	Orissa*$$	6790202	4445736	65.47
19.	Punjab	2330725	650209	27.90
20.	Rajasthan	6768541	2097560	30.99
21.	Sikkim	NR	NR	NR
22.	Tamil Nadu	9388118	2737921	29.16
23.	Tripura	595397	397798	66.81
24.	Uttar Pradesh	20430204	7541494	36.91

1	2	3	4	5
25.	West Bengal	11076686	4918296	44.40
26.	A and N Island	30221	6421	21.25
27.	D and N Haveli	26237	17231	65.67
28.	Daman and Diu	10735	395	3.68
29.	Lakshadweep	8625	885	10.26
30.	Pondicherry	133555	63262	47.37
	Total:	135360074	55570998	41.05

Source: Ministry of Rural Development
NR — Not Reported
*—Provisional
$$—Rural Households

SHRI MURLI DEORA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Swaranjayanti Gram Swarazgor Yojana (SGSY) Scheme is primarily created to provide self-employment to rural poor, especially, to those who are living below the poverty line. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what percentage of BPL families have been helped or covered under this scheme? What was the target? How many families are helped, and what amount has been spent on them?

SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL: Sir, the total number of self-help groups today— that is, from 1999 to March, 2003, — is 17,17,739. This is the number of self-help groups, and the benefits received by these self-help groups are to the tune of Rs. 16,11,630 and the amount that has so far been given in the form of subsidy to these people is to the tune of Rs. 2,709 crores.

SHRI MURLI DEORA: Sir, in part (c) of my question, I wanted to know from the Government whether there has been large-scale diversions or mis-utilisation from this fund. The hon. Minister, in his reply, has said that no such thing has happened. I would like to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the recommendation of the Standing Committee attached to his Ministry. And, Sir, I would read one line from it. It is said, "The Committee are concerned to note the findings of Midterm Appraisal of the Ninth Plan done by the Planning Commission according to which benefits under the SGSY meant for the poorest of the rural poor are being pocketed by unscrupulous people in connivance with the banks."

What has the Minister to say in this regard? You are saying that there is no diversion of funds. The Standing Committee and the Planning Commission themselves are saying that there is a large-scale diversion of these funds, and in connivance with the banks, other unscrupulous people are eating them away.

SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PAUL: Sir, no large scale misutilisation or diversion of funds have been reported; this has been, in fact, stated in the reply. We have received the latest reports according to which 17 States have made such irregularities and abnormalities, among which there is Maharashtra, too. However, Sir, out of the 17 States, only 4 States have replied satisfactorily, sing that whatever may be the diversification — not necessarily misutilization, but diversification — it can be recouped immediately after geting the funds. However, replies are still awaited from 13 States.

SHRI A. VIJAY ARAGHAVAN: Sir, this is a programme that is meant for the BPL families. It was mentioned in the report that only 4.59 per cent of the total B.P.L. families have been covered under this scheme during 1999-2002. That means only a microscopic minority of our BPL families are eligible to avail of the benefits under this scheme. Now, Sir, ttie Government has taken a new decision to reduce the number of BPL families. Earlier, the selection of BPL families was made after a scientific study. We had the Lakdawala Committee, which had done a study and accordingly, given the instructions for identifying the BPL families on the basis of calories of foods for poor families. That was done and directions were given accordingly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN: Sir, this is related to the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, put the question.

SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN: Sir, the Government has given a direction to reduce the number of BPL families through some other methods. Here, they have given instructions that those families, which are using fans, those families which are having lavatories, are not eligible for the BPL benefits. Why is this so? Lakhs and lakhs of families, millions of poor Indian people are denied this benefit of BPL. This is a very serious issue and the hon. Minister has to answer this. There is a great anguish among the poor throughout the country. A better mechanism has to be

evolved. Why have you given such directions and how are you going to resolve this issue?

श्री संजय निरूपम: सर, गाइडलाइन्स चेंज होनी चाहिएं । There must be proper guidelines.

श्री अन्नासाहेब एम.के.पाटील: सभापति जी, बी.पी.एल. लोगों की जो सेन्सस है, वह प्लानिंग कमीशन के मुताबिक एन.एस.एस.आई., नेशनल सेम्पल सर्वे आर्गेनाइजेशन करती हैं । उसने जो पहले उस साल में सर्वे करके रिपोर्ट दी थी तो उसमें जो क्राइटेरिया रखा था वह यह था कि It should be on the basis of income and expenditure of the family. जब उसने यह दस साल का पहला एक्सपीरिएंस देखा तो उसके ध्यान में आया कि हमने जो नॉर्म्स लगाई हैं उनमें कुछ डिफेक्ट हैं । इस वजह से कई कम्पलेंट भी आई कि इस तरीके से ठीक से बीपीएल फैमिलि का सर्वे नहीं, होता है, इसलिए इन नॉर्म्स को चेन्ज करिए । इसके बाद फिर एक कमेटी बनाई गई थी डा. संजीवा रेड्डी की अध्यक्षता में, जिसमें एकाडमी से लोग है,प्लानिंग कमीशन के लोग हैं, दूसरे एक्सपर्टस हैं । इस कमेटी ने इस पर थोड़ा सोच के अभी कुछ इंडिकेशन दिया, जिसमें रखा हैं कि इकोनोमिक और सोशल बैकग्राउंउ में भी देखा जाए ताकि उस आधार पर जो लिस्ट तैयार होगी वह सही ढंग से तैयार होगी । यह चेन्ज जैसे जैसे राज्यों की ओपिनियन आई, उसके हिसाब से हो गई हैं । यह होने के बाद मार्च, 2003 में सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने,जो पब्लिक पीपुल्स यूनियन की लिटिगेशन वहां चल रही थी, उसमें स्टे कर दिया हैं

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, तो स्टे हो गया हैं ।नेक्स्ट क्वैश्चन ।

State Disaster Management Authorities

*224. DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Ministry of Home Affairs has asked the States to set up State Disaster Management Authorities which would act as nodal agency in dealing with emergency situation; and

(b) if so, the number of States which have taken action in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SWAMI CHINMAYANAND): (a) The Ministry of Home Affairs has advised the State Governments and the Union Territory Administrations to set up a Disaster Management Authority to ensure that coordinated steps are taken for mitigation, preparedness, response and relief.